No. 11-55016

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

TARLA MAKAEFF, Individually and on Behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellant,

VS.

TRUMP UNIVERSITY, LLC,

Defendant-Counter-Claimant-Appellee.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of California No. 3:10-cv-00940-IEG(WVG) The Honorable Irma E. Gonzalez

UNOPPOSED RULE 39-1.8 MOTION TO TRANSFER ISSUE OF APPELLATE ATTORNEYS' FEES TO THE DISTRICT COURT

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP ERIC ALAN ISAACSON (120584) RACHEL L. JENSEN (211456) THOMAS R. MERRICK (177987) 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/231-1058

619/231-7423 (fax)

ZELDES HAEGGQUIST & ECK, LLP HELEN I. ZELDES (220051) AMBER L. ECK (177882) 625 Broadway, Suite 1000 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/342-8000 619/342-7878 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellant [Additional counsel appear on signature page.]

Appellant Tarla Makaeff respectfully moves the Court to transfer the issue of appellate attorneys' fees to the district court.

Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1.8 states that "[a]ny party who is *or may be* eligible for attorneys fees on appeal to this Court may, within the time permitted in Circuit Rule 39-1.6, file a motion to transfer consideration of attorneys fees on appeal to the district court or administrative agency from which the appeal was taken." Ninth Cir. Rule 39-1.8 (emphasis added). Such a motion thus is timely if filed within 14 days after the disposition of a petition for rehearing. Ninth Cir. Rule 39-1.6. This Court frequently transfers issues of appellate attorneys' fees to the district court under Rule 39-1.8, often doing so sua sponte. *See, e.g., Am. Jewish Cong. v. City of Beverly Hills*, 90 F.3d 379, 386 (9th Cir. 1996) (en banc); *Webb v. Ada County*, 285 F.3d 829, 841 (9th Cir. 2002); *Siegel v. Fed. Home Loan Mortg. Corp.*, 143 F.3d 525, 534 (9th Cir. 1998).

On November 27, 2013, this Court denied Trump University's petition for rehearing. In light of this Court's decision in this appeal, reversing the district court's denial of Makaeff's Anti-SLAPP motion and requiring the district court to reconsider its ruling, *see Makaeff v. Trump Univ.*, *LLC*, 715 F.3d 254, 271 (9th Cir. 2013), Makaeff may well be entitled to attorneys' fees. State law controls the award of

attorneys' fees on state-law issues in diversity cases.¹ And California's Anti-SLAPP statute provides that "a prevailing defendant on a special motion to strike shall be entitled to recover his or her attorney's fees and costs." Cal. Code Civ. P. §425.16(c).

This provision, affording attorneys' fees to a prevailing defendant, is an essential component of the Anti-SLAPP statute, and furthers the state legislature's expressed goal of discouraging non-meritorious actions calculated to chill free speech.² As the concurring opinion accompanying this Court's order denying Trump University's petition for rehearing observes, "Trump University's counterclaim was obviously designed to overwhelm Makaeff by making it more burdensome and expensive for her to pursue her deceptive business practices claims against Trump University." *Makaeff v. Trump Univ., LLC*, No. 11-55016, 2013 U.S. App. LEXIS 23900, at *16-*17 (9th Cir. Nov. 27, 2013).

A California statute authorizing a prevailing-party fee award generally includes appellate attorney fees unless the statute specifically provides otherwise.³ California's

See Alyeska Pipeline Serv. Co. v. Wilderness Soc'y, 421 U.S. 240, 259 n.31 (1975); Riordan v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., 589 F.3d 999, 1005 (9th Cir. 2009); Carnes v. Zamani, 488 F.3d 1057, 1059 (9th Cir. 2007).

See generally Averill v. Superior Court, 50 Cal. Rptr. 2d 62, 65 (Cal. App. 1996) (explaining the Anti-SLAPP statute's purpose) (citing *Dixon v. Superior Court*, 36 Cal. Rptr. 2d 687, 693 (Cal. App. 1994)).

³ See Morcos v. Bd. of Ret., 800 P.2d 543, 545 (Cal. 1990); Grade-Way Constr. Co. v. Golden Eagle Ins. Co., 16 Cal. Rptr. 2d 649, 656 (Cal. App. 1993).

Anti-SLAPP statute, in particular, "does not preclude recovery of appellate attorney fees by a prevailing defendant-respondent; hence they are recoverable." *Wanland v. Law Offices of Mastagni, Holstedt & Chiurazzi*, 45 Cal. Rptr. 3d 633, 637 (Cal. App. 2006) (quoting *Evans v. Unkow*, 45 Cal. Rptr. 2d 624, 630 (Cal. App. 1995)); *accord Dove Audio Inc. v. Rosenfeld, Meyer & Susman*, 54 Cal. Rptr. 2d 830, 835 (Cal. App. 1996).

This Court's decisions appear to be inconsistent, however, with respect to whether a district court may award prevailing-party attorneys' fees for appellate work absent an express transfer order from this Court. This Court has held that a district court may, following a remand, award prevailing-party attorneys' fees for work done on an appeal that contributed to the eventual judgment. See Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp. v. Entm't Distrib., 429 F.3d 869, 884 (9th Cir. 2005). This Court's decision in Twentieth Century Fox, involving the copyright-law's prevailing-party provision, flatly rejects contentions, "[r]elying heavily on Circuit Rules 39-1.6 and 39-1.8, . . . that the district court was without jurisdiction to award appeal fees . . . because Twentieth Century Fox Parties did not first file an application with us to recover fees and expenses." 429 F.3d at 884. This Court held: "We see no abuse of discretion in the district court's decision to award Twentieth Century Fox Parties its fees for the prior summary judgment appeal." *Id*.

Yet this Court's decision in *Cummings v. Connell*, 402 F.3d 936, 940 (9th Cir. 2005), held that a district court's prevailing-party award of appellate attorneys' fees was improper where no transfer was sought under Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1.8: "In the absence of such a transfer, the district court was not authorized to rule on the request for appellate attorney's fees." *Cummings*, 402 F.3d at 948. In *Cummings*, "plaintiffs' request was filed way out of time – nine months after time for filing a petition for rehearing or suggestion for rehearing en banc had expired." *Id.* at 948 n.6.

Out of an abundance of caution, and as an application for prevailing-party attorneys' fees would be premature before in fact Makaeff prevails on her Anti-SLAPP motion on remand, *see Makaeff*, 715 F.3d at 271, Makaeff now respectfully requests transfer of the issue of appellate attorneys' fees to the district court in compliance with Rule 39-1.8's provision that "[a]ny party who is *or may be* eligible for attorneys fees on appeal to this Court may, within the time permitted in Circuit Rule 39-1.6, file a motion to transfer consideration of attorneys fees on appeal to the district court or administrative agency from which the appeal was taken." Ninth Cir. Rule 39-1.8 (emphasis added).

Counsel for Trump University was contacted by phone and, informed of this motion's substance, stated that she does not oppose a Rule 39-1.8 transfer for the district court to consider the issue of appellate fees if and when it may become appropriate.

DATED: December 10, 2013 Respectfully submitted,

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP ERIC ALAN ISAACSON RACHEL L. JENSEN THOMAS R. MERRICK

s/ ERIC ALAN ISAACSON ERIC ALAN ISAACSON

655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax)

ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP
AMANDA M. FRAME
Post Montgomery Center
One Montgomery Street, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94104
Telephone: 415/288-4545
415/288-4534 (fax)

ZELDES HAEGGQUIST & ECK, LLP HELEN I. ZELDES AMBER L. ECK 625 Broadway, Suite 1000 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/342-8000 619/342-7878 (fax)

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Counter-Defendant-Appellant

Case: 11-5501	.6, 12/10/2013, ID: 8896614, DktEntry: 75, Page 8 of 10
9th Circuit Case Number(s)	11-55016
NOTE: To secure your input, you	ou should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > PDF Printer/Creator).
*********	*********************
When All Case Partici	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE pants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System
United States Court of Appea	nically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the als for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system
on (date) December 10, 20	013
I certify that all participants i accomplished by the appellat	n the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be e CM/ECF system.
Signature (use "s/" format)	s/ Eric Alan Isaacson
********	********************
	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
When Not All Case Parti	cipants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System
	nically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the als for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system .
Participants in the case who a CM/ECF system.	are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate
have mailed the foregoing do	the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I cument by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it arrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following
Signature (use "s/" format)	

Case: 11-55016, 12/10/2013, ID: 8896614, DktEntry: 75, Page 9 of 10

Return to Service List Page

Service List for Case: 11-55016 Tarla Makaeff et al v. Trump University LLC et al

Current Associated Cases: none

CAUTION: If the word *Active* is in the **ECF Filing Status** column, then your electronic filing will constitute service to the party

If Not Registered, Exempt, Exemption Expired, Pending, Rejected, or Suspended appears in the ECF Filing Status column (or it is blank), then you must service this party by US Mail.

Contact Info	Case Number/s	Service Preference	ECF Filing Status
Christopher M. Burke Scott & Scott LLP Suite 1000 707 Broadway 10th Floor San Diego, CA 92101 Email: cburke@scott-scott.com	<u>11-55016</u>	Email	Active
Amber Eck Zeldes Haeggquist & Eck, LLP 625 Broadway San Diego, CA 92101 Email: Ambere@zhlaw.com	11-55016	Email	Active
Amanda M. Frame ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP Suite 1900 655 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101-8498 Email: aframe@rgrdlaw.com	11-55016	Email	Active
Eric Alan Isaacson ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP Suite 1900 655 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101-8498 Email: erici@rgrdlaw.com	11-55016	Email	Active
Rachel L. Jensen ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP Suite 1900 655 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101-8498 Email: rachelj@rgrdlaw.com	11-55016	Email	Active
John David Loy ACLU Foundation of San Diego and Imperial Counties P.O. Box 87131 San Diego, CA 92138 Email: davidloy@aclusandiego.org	<u>11-55016</u>	Email	Active
Jill Ann Martin c/o Trump National Golf Club	11-55016	Email	Active

Case: 11-55016, 12/10/2013, ID: 8896614, DktEntry: 75, Page 10 of 10

One Ocean Trails Dr. Rancho Palos Verdes, CA 90275 Email: jmartin@trumpnational.com			
Thomas R. Merrick ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD LLP Suite 1900 655 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101-8498 Email: tmerrick@rgrdlaw.com	<u>11-55016</u>	Email	Active
David Keith Schneider Yunker & Schneider Suite 1400 655 West Broadway San Diego, CA 92101 Email: dks@yslaw.com	<u>11-55016</u>	Email	Active